



## **Texas Department of Insurance**

### **Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## **MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

VISTA MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL  
44301 VISTA RD  
PASADENA, TX 77504

#### **Respondent Name**

PACIFIC EMPLOYERS INSURANCE CO

#### **Carrier's Austin Representative Box**

Box Number 15

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-05-0239-01

#### **MFDR Date Received**

SEPTEMBER 3, 2004

### **REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "The Carrier denied charges with code 'C', and there is not a contractual agreement between the Healthcare Provider and the Carrier. The Carrier incorrectly took a 'PPO' reduction, too."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$11,496.24

### **RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Respondent's Position Summary:** The respondent did not submit a response.

**Response Submitted by:** N/A

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
November 18, 2003	Outpatient Hospital Services	\$11,496.24	\$0.00

### **FINDINGS AND DECISION**

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

#### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 *Texas Register* 4047, requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in

establishing the fee guidelines.

4. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
  - C-Negotiated Contract
  - U-Unnecessary medical treatment guidelines
  - O-Denial after reconsideration

## **Findings**

Records stored in the MFDR section indicate that the TDI-DWC, formerly the Commission, received a request for medical fee dispute resolution on September 3, 2004. After an exhaustive search, MFDR was unable to locate this dispute file. Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter on May 31, 2012 requesting copies of any documents originally sent to TDI-DWC. Each party was given the opportunity to submit the requested documentation and supplemental documentation. The division received original/supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date is considered.

1. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with reason code U – “Unnecessary medical treatment guidelines.” Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.301, effective July 15, 2000, 25 *Texas Register* 2115, states, in pertinent part, that “The insurance carrier shall not retrospectively review the medical necessity of a medical bill for treatment(s) and/or service(s) for which the health care provider has obtained preauthorization under Chapter 134 of this title (relating to Guidelines for Medical Services, Charges, and Payments).” Review of the submitted information finds documentation to support that the health care provider obtained preauthorization for the disputed services. The Division further finds that the insurance carrier performed a retrospective review of the medical necessity of the medical bill for the disputed treatment(s) and/or service(s) for which the health care provider had obtained preauthorization. The Division concludes that the insurance carrier has failed to meet the requirements of §133.301. This denial reason is not supported. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed per applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
2. The insurance carrier reduced or denied disputed services with reason code C – “Negotiated Contract” Review of the submitted information finds insufficient documentation to support that the disputed services are subject to a contractual agreement between the parties to this dispute. The above denial/reduction reason is not supported. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed for payment in accordance with applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “the requestor’s reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid.” Review of the submitted documentation finds no documentation of the requestor’s reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii).
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).
5. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.” Review of the requestor’s documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
6. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
  - The requestor did not provide documentation to demonstrate how it determined its usual and customary charges for the disputed services.
  - Documentation of the comparison of charges to other carriers was not presented for review.

- Documentation of the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services was not presented for review.
- The Division has previously found that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital's costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors,” as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, 22 *Texas Register* 6276. It further states that “Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered... and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges...” 22 *Texas Register* 6268-6269. Therefore, the use of a hospital's “usual and customary” charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The requestor did not submit a copy of the alleged contract for review.
- While managed care contracts are relevant to determining a fair and reasonable reimbursement, the Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a percentage of a hospital's billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, which states at 22 *Texas Register* 6276 that:  

“A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.”

Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital's billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not support that the requested alternative reimbursement methodology would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

## **Conclusion**

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

## **ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the services in dispute.

## **Authorized Signature**

	Patricia Rodriguez	09/07/2012
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

### ***YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL***

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**